

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

HENRY LANDSMAN,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:15-cv-01470-JCM-NJK

ORDER

(Docket Nos. 24, 25)

Pending before the Court are the parties' proposed discovery plans, Docket Nos. 24, 25, which are hereby **DENIED**. The discovery plans are defective in numerous respects. First, discovery plans must be submitted jointly by the parties. *See* Local Rule 26-1(d) (requiring that "the parties shall submit a stipulated discovery plan"). In this instance, the parties separately filed discovery plans, which is improper.

Second, and more significantly, the discovery plans include an unsupported request to stay discovery pending resolution of Defendant's motion to dismiss. *See* Docket No. 24 at 3. "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). Instead, parties seeking to stay discovery pending resolution of a dispositive motion must file a proper request addressing the relevant standards. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013) (outlining applicable standards). Those standards have not been addressed in the current filings, so the request to stay discovery is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice.

1 To the extent the parties seek a stay of discovery, they must file a proper request for that relief
2 no later than December 10, 2015. If such a request is filed, the parties do not need to file a discovery
3 plan unless and until such relief is denied. If a request to stay discovery is not filed, the parties must file
4 a joint proposed discovery plan no later than December 17, 2015.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: December 3, 2015

7
8 
9 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge